



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,574	10/24/2001	Hannu Kuoksa	33047/240187	5083
826	7590	10/19/2007	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP			HENDRICKSON, STUART L	
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA			ART UNIT	
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			PAPER NUMBER	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/003,574	Applicant(s) KUOKSA, HANNU	
	Examiner Stuart Hendrickson	Art Unit 1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-12, 14, 15 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-12, 14, 15, 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1793

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baines 5822220 taken with Mosow 5213663, Hultman et al. 4311666 and Engdahl 4762590.

Baines teaches in columns 5 and 9 computer control of a causticization process. The computer can monitor any parameter characteristic of the system and send via feedback loop controls to other inputs to achieve a stable reaction system. The differences versus the claims is what variables are monitored. Musow teaches in columns 2 and 4 that each system can have a different variable measured, like titratable alkali or density. Hultman teaches the measurement of green density and control of white infeed. Concerning the addition of white liquor to the process, Engdahl teaches this in col. 3 and fig. 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control the infeeds as in Hultman and monitor the density or alkali in the process of Baines because doing so asserts control over the process for monitoring for optimum results. Adding white liquor is an obvious expedient to form the desired carbonate product. Note that in general, processes can be optimized (In re Boesch 205 USPQ 215). The workings of how the computer makes calculations (claims 8, 12, 14) are deemed conventional as to how computer control programs work- see Baines columns 8-9. Choosing coefficients which accurately model reality is an obvious expedient, to assure efficiency.

Applicant's arguments filed 8/24/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Previous arguments and comments are incorporated herein by reference; using a different equation to monitor a process is an obvious expedient, given the teachings of the references. The references need not use the identical schemes of monitoring and controlling. It is also noted, that in general chemists like to control the amounts of reagents, to control yield, cost and efficiency. The arguments are to the references separately and are conclusionary. They

Art Unit: 1793

overlook what is obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill and are thus not persuasive. The examiner agrees (pg. 9 bottom) that when the prior art teaches a variety of computer control schemes and an applicant picks one which is suggested, they should not expect a patent. Concerning Hultman, a copy of the reference is available. See col. 1 lines 20-25 and col. 10 lines 10-15.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.



Stuart Hendrickson
examiner Art Unit 1754